

**REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claim 18 is cancelled.

Claims 1, 10, 13, 15-17, 19, 24, 25 and 27 are currently being amended.

This amendment changes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-4, 6-17, 19 and 24-27 are now pending in this application.

**Specification**

The title was objected to for not being descriptive. In response, Applicant has amended the title to read "A METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR DATA TRANSMISSION TO REMOTE DEVICES." The specification was objected to for containing hyperlinks. In response, the specification has been amended to remove hyperlinks from the text. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the objection be withdrawn.

**Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1-4, 6-19 and 24-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Han et al. in view of Applicant Admitted Prior Art (AAPA). In response, without agreeing or acquiescing to the rejection, Applicant has cancelled claim 18 and amended independent claims 1, 10, 13, 15-17, 19, 24, 25 and 27. Further, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for the reasons set forth below.

Applicant relies on MPEP § 2143, which requires that all the claim limitations be considered. Considering all the claim limitations as required by MPEP § 2143.03, the cited references do not identically disclose, teach or suggest all the claim limitations. *See In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974).

Claim 1 is directed to a method of generating data and transmitting that data to receiving devices. Claim 10 is directed to a computing device arranged to hold data intended for transmission to at least one of a predetermined combination of data receiving devices. Claims 13, 25 and 27 are directed to a device arranged to concurrently establish a data connection between a computing device and at least a first and a second data-receiving device. Claims 15 and 24 are directed toward a network comprising at least one computing device and at least two data receiving devices. Claims 16, 17 and 19 are directed toward computer storage mediums having stored thereon computer program codes.

For example, the method of claim 1 recites classifying the at least first and second data-receiving devices into a set of predetermined classifications that identify the data output capability of the at least first and second data-receiving devices; connecting to the first and second data-receiving devices, wherein the connection is treated as a single session; giving the first and second data-receiving devices a single session ID; receiving a request for the data from at least one of the data-receiving devices; obtaining the predetermined classification that identifies the data output capability of the at least one data-receiving device requesting the data; and selecting portions of the data for transmission to at least one of the data-receiving devices depending upon the at least one rule and the predetermined classification that identifies the data output capability of the at least one data-receiving devices requesting the data.” (emphasis added.) Independent claims 10, 13, 15-17, 19, 24, 25 and 27 contain similar limitations.

Han does not disclose, teach or suggest each and every element of the independent claims. Han is directed to an XML framework used in multi-device web browsing. Han discloses a framework that splits a web page and delivers appropriate partial views of the web page to multiple user devices. On page six, the Final Office Action acknowledges that Han fails to disclose “the identifiers provide an indication of a portion of data relative to other portions of the same data.” To cure the deficiencies of Han, the Office Action relies on AAPA. The Office Action asserts that AAPA discloses priority tag values of high, medium and low of each page.

However, Han and AAPA fail to identically disclose, teach or suggest, alone or in combination “classifying the at least first and second data-receiving devices into a set of

predetermined classifications that identify the data output capability of the at least first and second data-receiving devices,” “obtaining the predetermined classification that identifies the data output capability of the at least one data-receiving device requesting the data” and “selecting portions of the data for transmission to at least one of the data-receiving devices depending upon the at least one rule and the predetermined classification that identifies the data output capability of the at least one data-receiving devices requesting the data” as claimed in independent claim 1. Further, Han and AAPA fail to disclose similar limitations contained in independent claims 10, 13, 15-17, 19, 24, 25 and 27.

Section 2.2 of Han discloses an XML policy file which governs which XML tags should be distributed to which privilege groups and which devices. As shown in Figure 4, where each tag is sent is determined by the tags each privilege group is permitted to receive. Determining what data is sent based on a privilege group is not the same as “selecting portions of the data for transmission to at least one of the data-receiving devices depending upon the at least one rule and the predetermined classification that identifies the data output capability of the at least one data-receiving devices requesting the data.” (emphasis added.) Thus, Han fails to identically disclose each and every limitation of the amended independent claims. Further, AAPA fails to cure the deficiency of Han.

Accordingly, the combination of Han and AAPA fail to disclose each and every element set forth in independent claims 1, 10, 13, 15-17, 19, 24, 25 and 27. Claims 2-4, 6-9, 11, 12, 14 and 26 depend from one of independent claims 1, 10, 13 and 25 and should be allowed for the reasons set forth above without regard to further patentable limitations contained therein.

If this rejection of the claims is maintained, the examiner is respectfully requested to point out where the above-mentioned features are disclosed in the cited references.

### Conclusion

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

*At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account 08-2025 pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.25. Additionally, charge any fees to Deposit Account 08-2025 under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 through § 1.21 inclusive, and any other sections in Title 37 of the Code of Federal Regulations that may regulate fees.*

Respectfully submitted,

By   
\_\_\_\_\_  
WT Ellis

Date November 3, 2008

Customer Number: 22879  
Telephone: (202) 672-5485  
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

William T. Ellis  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 26,874